



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,106	09/14/2007	Heiko Schwertner	14519-00001-US	5448
23416 7590 02/03/2010 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP P O BOX 2207 WILMINGTON, DE 19899				
EXAMINER				
WECKER, JENNIFER				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1797				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/03/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/589,106

Applicant(s)

SCHWERTNER ET AL.

Examiner

JENNIFER WECKER

Art Unit

1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/10/2006, 4/23/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 24 and 25 provide for the use of the device, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-14, 16-17, 19-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown III. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,160,701), previously of record.

3. Regarding Claim 1, Brown III. et al. teach a device to detect molecules or molecules classes or molecule mixtures (see abstract and Col. 1 lines 15-26), characterized in that

a) at least two surfaces with immobilized molecules or molecule classes are provided on a panel of the device (referred to as matrix 12), whereby one surface is employed for control or standardization purposes (referred to as surface 12b), and the other serves to detect an analyte (referred to as sample-contacting surface (reaction site) 12a) (see Col. 6 lines 21-30), whereby

b) the two surfaces are structured in such a manner that they come into contact at the same point in time with an entire sample from which molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures are to be tested for (see Col. 3 lines 15-28 and Figure 1),

c) whereby both surfaces are structured and arranged with respect to each other in such a manner that they are evaluated jointly, thereby forming a graphic arrangement that can be read out visually. See Col. 10 line 64 - Col. 11 lines 67 and Figures 3C and 6A-C.

4. Regarding Claim 2, Brown III. et al. teach a device to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the surfaces are in a planar and/or spatial arrangement with respect to each other. See Figure 1, Col.3 lines 15-26, and Col. 6 lines 21-30.

5. Regarding Claim 3, Brown III. et al. teach a device to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the sample from which the analyte or analytes is to be tested for is present in liquid, solid or gaseous form or else

in physical intermediate states or combinations thereof. See Col. 3 lines 1 – 26 and Col. 6 lines 44-59.

6. Regarding Claim 4, Brown III et al. teach a device to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the surfaces are represented by one or more symbols linearly or in a matrix arranged in a different manner. See Figure 1 and Col. 10 line 64 – Col. 11 line 67.

7. Regarding Claim 5, Brown III et al. teach a device to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the immobilized molecules or molecule classes are visually evaluated together by means of a detection reaction without additional technical aids, whereby the various surfaces appear colored, black, gray, or are tinted in a mixture of colors and/or shades of gray. See Col. 7 lines 34 -43.

8. Regarding Claim 6, Brown III et al. teach a device to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that it is configured as a vessel having one or more openings (referred to as fluid chamber 17). See Col. 6 lines 44-50 and Figure 3A.

9. Regarding Claim 7, Brown III et al. teach a device to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the surfaces are located inside the vessel (referred to as fluid chamber 17) or else on or more surfaces are located on the vessel wall. See Figure 3A.

10. Regarding Claim 8, Brown III et al. teach a device to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the surfaces are rendered visible as symbols, “—” for negative and “+” for positive, or a circle for negative and a

circle with a dot or dots in it for positive. See Col. 11 lines 49 – 67, Col. 17 lines 37 – 60, and Figures 3B and 3C.

11. Regarding Claim 9, Brown III et al. teach a device to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the immobilized molecules or molecule classes and/or mixtures are selected from a group consisting of antibodies, antigens, DNA, RNA, enzymes, substrates, receptors, ligands, or combinations thereof. See abstract.

12. Regarding Claim 10, Brown III et al. teach a method to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures comprising

a) establishing contact between a sample from which molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures are to be tested for with the panel of a device in such a manner that they come into contact at the same point in time with the entire sample from which molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures are to be tested for (see Col. 3 lines 50-60), whereby at least two surfaces on the panel of the device are provided with immobilized molecules or molecule classes and/or mixtures in such a way that one surface is employed for control or standardization purposes (referred to as surface 12b), and the other serves to detect an analyte (referred to as sample-contacting surface 12a), and whereby the two surfaces are structured and arranged with respect to each other in such a manner that they are evaluated together, and that they form a graphic arrangement that can be read out visually (see Col. 10 line 64 - Col. 11 lines 67 and Figures 3C and 6A-C), and

b) read-out and evaluation of the surfaces. See Col. 4 lines 6-12.

13. Regarding Claim 11, Brown III et al. teach a method to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the surfaces are read out in a planar and/or spatial manner. See Figure 1, Col.3 lines 15-26, and Col. 6 lines 21-30.

14. Regarding Claim 12, Brown III et al. teach a method to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the various detection surfaces appear colored, black or gray, or are tinted in a mixture of colors and/or shades of gray. See Col. 7 lines 34 -43.

15. Regarding Claim 13, Brown III et al. teach a method to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the surfaces are read out in one or many symbols linearly or in a matrix arranged in a different manner. See Figure 1 and Col. 10 line 64 – Col. 11 line 67.

16. Regarding Claim 14, Brown III et al. teach a method to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the surfaces are rendered visible as symbols, "-" for negative and "+" for positive, or a circle for negative and a circle with a dot or dots in it for positive. See Col. 11 lines 49 – 67, Col. 17 lines 37 – 60, and Figures 3B and 3C.

17. Regarding Claim 16, Brown III et al. teach a method to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the sample from which the analytes is/are tested for is present in liquid, solid or gaseous form or else in physical intermediate states or combinations thereof. See Col. 3 lines 1 – 26 and Col. 6 lines 44-59.

18. Regarding Claim 17, Brown III et al. teach a method to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that whole blood, capillary blood, umbilical cord blood, arterial or venous whole blood, serum, plasma, urine, feces, tears, saliva, body mucus, dyed solutions, solutions containing solid constituents or high-viscosity liquids are used as the sample. See Col. 1 lines 16-26.
19. Regarding Claim 19, Brown III et al. teach a method to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the detection reactions of molecules, molecule classes or molecule mixtures are selected from dye, radio nucleotide, antibody, DNA or RNA, biotin, avidine or enzyme detection reactions or combinations thereof. See Col.2 lines 21-34, Col. 9 lines 16-34, and Col. 11 lines 16-26.
20. Regarding Claim 20, Brown III et al. teach a method to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the immobilized molecules or molecule classes and/or mixtures are visually tested for by means of a detection reaction without additional technical aids. See Col. 3 lines 15-47.
21. Regarding Claim 21, Brown III et al. teach a method to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that technical aids are employed for the read-out and/or evaluation in order to allow a visual evaluation (specifically a conventional spectrophotometer is used), or else the method for instance, densitometric methods, spectroscopic or electrochemical methods are combined with the read-out and/or evaluation according to the invention. See Col. 7 lines 34-54.
22. Regarding Claim 22, Brown III et al. teach a method to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the method is combined

with flow-through tests, agglutination tests and/or solid-phase tests and it comprises one, several or many pairs of symbols. See Col. 3 line 36 – Col. 4 line 13 and Col. 9 lines 35-44.

23. Regarding Claim 23, Brown III et al. teach a method to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the method is combined with the fast lateral-flow test method, and it comprises two, several or many pairs of symbols. See Col. 3 line 50 – Col. 4 line 13.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

24. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

25. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

26. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown III et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,160,701) in view of Gao et al. (U.S. PGPub 2006/0134804).

27. Regarding Claim 15, Brown III et al. teach a method to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures characterized in that the surfaces are rendered visible as symbols, "-" for negative and "+" for positive, or a circle for negative and a circle with a dot or dots in it for positive. See Col. 11 lines 49 – 67, Col. 17 lines 37 – 60, and Figures 3B and 3C. Brown III et al. does not explicitly teach symbols consisting of several circles inside each other having one center dot are rendered visible, said dot appearing only in a positive detection case, and whereby each individual circle only becomes visible above a certain concentration value of the analyte or a star with which each of the spokes becomes visible above a certain concentration value and, in the positive case, a predefined spoke appears or the individual spokes detect the presence of several analytes and one spoke appears above a certain concentration value or a combination of these symbols.

28. In the analogous art of devices and methods for analyte assays, Gao et al. teach a test device for detecting the presence of an analyte in a liquid sample and indicating to the user the presence or absence of the analyte with recognizable symbols. Gao et al. also teach that the "recognizable symbol" can be a plus sign, a minus sign, a dash, a bar, an "X," or another symbol known in the art or in general as conveying a particular meaning that can be associated with the assay result. Any meaningful symbol can be selected, such as a letter from the Roman alphabet, a number, a mathematical operator, a scientific symbol, or a letter from another language or alphabet system, for example a letter from the Chinese, Japanese, or Arabic alphabets. See [0028].

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Brown III, et al. to provide any meaningful symbol for the control and detection areas for the benefit of providing easily read and understandable symbols/results to an untrained user.

29. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown III et al. in view of Blatt et al. (U.S. PGPub 2005/0249633).

30. Regarding Claim 18, Brown III et al. does not teach that the sample is prepared before, during or afterwards by means of purification, aliquotation, derivatization and/or isolation in order to be applied onto the panel according to the invention.

31. In the analogous art of analytical devices for detecting at least two analytes, Blatt et al. teach that further manipulations may be required (such as extraction or purification) to prepare a sample suitable for testing for analytes. See [0079]. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of the Brown III et al. invention to provide additional preparation/manipulation (such as purification) of the sample for the benefit of making the sample more suitable for testing and speeding up the testing time.

32. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,160,701), previously of record.

33. Regarding Claim 24, Brown III et al. does not explicitly teach the use of a device, as presented in claim 1, to detect molecules or molecule classes in human medicine, veterinary medicine or in plant diagnostics, food-product diagnostics, environmental diagnostics, pharmacology, toxicology, in the case of allergies, diseases of the auto-

immune system or of the metabolic system, infectious diseases, venereal diseases, parasitic diseases, detection of small molecules such as drugs, pharmaceuticals or metabolites, cell mediators, tissue typing, species typing, food typing, antigen typing, epitotyping and DNA or RNA detection. Brown III et al. does teach that the device can be used to improve conventional solid-phase immunoassay techniques for performing colorimetric or other enzyme immunoassay of biological fluids. See Col. 4 lines 38-44. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the Brown III device could have also been used for any of the above described purposes for the benefit of increasing the general usefulness and applicability of the device.

34. Regarding Claim 25, Brown III et al. does teach that the device can be used to improve conventional solid-phase immunoassay techniques for performing colorimetric or other enzyme immunoassay of biological fluids. See Col. 4 lines 38-44. Brown III et al. does not explicitly teach the use of a method to detect molecules or molecule classes or molecule mixtures, as presented in claim 20, for diagnosis immediately before, during or after a therapeutic measure. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the that the Brown III device could have been used for this purpose since it is well known in the art that conventional solid-phase immunoassays or enzyme immunoassays can be used to diagnose a patient before, during or after a therapeutic measure. See Col. 1 lines 28-58.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JENNIFER WECKER whose telephone number is (571)270-1109. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8 AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JAW

/Jill Warden/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797